



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,393	04/10/2001	Michael E. McHenry	608-281	8969
4249	7590	07/25/2005	EXAMINER ROSEN, NICHOLAS D	
CAROL WILSON BP AMERICA INC. MAIL CODE 5 EAST 4101 WINFIELD ROAD WARRENVILLE, IL 60555			ART UNIT 3625	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/829,393

**Applicant(s)**

MCHENRY ET AL.

**Examiner**

Nicholas D. Rosen

**Art Unit**

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/15/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-32 and 34 have been examined.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

#### **Claims 1-22 and 34**

Claims 1, 2, 3, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the anonymous article, "Telco, LML, Apollo Tyres Tie up with Castrol," hereinafter "Telco," in view of Osborn et al. (U.S. Patent 6,182,048). As per claim 1, "Telco" discloses (c) providing a motor oil having recommended, or user desired enhancements (first paragraph) based on (a) data including type information about the motor vehicle in

which the engine oil is to be utilized sufficient to identify a user's requirements (first paragraph). "Telco" does not disclose analyzing the data by computer, but Osborn teaches analyzing motor vehicle related information by computer (column 3, line 27, through column 6, line 35). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to analyze the data by computer, and provide an engine oil responsive to the data analysis, for the obvious advantage of using a computer for calculations that may be difficult or time-consuming for human beings to perform, e.g., involving multivariate linear regression, as taught in Osborn, to provide a motor oil selected on the basis of numerous factors.

As per claim 2, "Telco" discloses basing a decision on type of vehicle, and selecting a lubricant as recommended based on the type of vehicle (first paragraph).

As per claim 3, Osborn teaches computer analysis based on expected ambient temperatures (column 5, line 61, through column 6, line 35). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to practice (a) to input at least one of expected ambient temperatures, average driving distance, normal type of driving, and interest in fuel economy, cold weather starting, and engine longevity, for the obvious advantage of providing an engine oil suited to a particular user's needs.

As per claim 4, "Telco" discloses making available a customized engine oil (first paragraph).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Telco" and Osborn as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of official notice. "Telco"

does not disclose that (a) is practiced by displaying a questionnaire on a computer screen connected to a wide area computer network, and prompting a user to input information into the questionnaire. However, official notice is taken that it is well known to obtain data by displaying a questionnaire on a computer screen connected to a wide area computer network (e.g., the Internet), and prompting a user to input information into the questionnaire. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do this, for the obvious advantage of conveniently obtaining desired data from a user who may be remote from the computer analyzing the data.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Telco" and Osborn as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of official notice. As per claim 6, "Telco" does not disclose that (a) is practiced by displaying a questionnaire on a computer screen connected to a wide area computer network, and prompting a user to input information into the questionnaire. However, official notice is taken that it is well known to obtain data by displaying a questionnaire on a computer screen connected to a global computer network (i.e., the Internet), and prompting a user to input information into the questionnaire. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do this, for the obvious advantage of conveniently obtaining desired data from a user who may be remote from the computer analyzing the data.

As per claim 7, "Telco" does not disclose displaying on the computer screen indicia indicating the ability of the user to order other automotive products, but official

Art Unit: 3625

notice is taken that it is well known to display advertising indicia on computer screens.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to display displaying on the computer screen indicia indicating the ability of the user to order other automotive products, for the obvious advantage of profiting from the sale of automotive products to persons likely to be interested in buying them.

Claims 8-12, 14, 15, 16, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Telco" and Osborn as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Denis et al. (U.S. Patent 4,954,273). As per claims 8-12, "Telco" is not explicit about the composition of the lubes, but Denis teaches a customized motor oil containing about 86.24 percent of a baseline motor oil, and at least one of a fuel economy additive, an antiwear additive, a detergent additive, a dispersant additive, a corrosion inhibitor, an antioxidant, a pour point depressant, or a blend stability additive (Fully Formed Example III, column 13, lines 46-68). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of engine lubrication at the time of applicant's invention to practice (c) to provide a baseline motor oil of from about 50, 60, 75, or 80 percent to 99.9 percent of the final customized engine oil, and at least one of the listed additives, for the obvious advantages of producing increased fuel economy, reduced wear, etc.

As per claim 14, Denis teaches providing an absolute increase of from about 0.1-10% in at least one selected from the group consisting of fuel economy additives, antiwear additives, detergent additives, dispersant additives, oxidation control additives, corrosion inhibitors, pour point depressants, and blend stability additives (Fully Formed

Example III, column 13, lines 46-68). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of engine lubrication at the time of applicant's invention to practice (c) to add additives as listed, for the obvious advantages of producing increased fuel economy, reduced wear, etc.

As per claim 15, Denis teaches providing additives leading to at least two or more enhanced features selected from enhanced wear protection, enhanced fuel economy, enhanced detergency, enhanced dispersancy, enhanced low temperature startability, enhanced high temperature viscosity, extended drain capability, enhanced wear protection, corrosion protection, enhanced control of oxidation and enhanced blend stability (Fully Formed Example III, column 13, lines 46-68). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of engine lubrication at the time of applicant's invention to practice (c) to add additives leading to at least two or more of the listed enhanced features, for the obvious advantages of producing increased fuel economy, reduced wear, etc.

As per claim 16, likewise, Denis teaches adding additives leading to at least three of said enhanced features, making claim 16 obvious on the same grounds as claim 15.

As per claim 21, Denis does not expressly disclose that (c) is practiced to change at least one of detergent and dispersant concentration levels over the range from about -50% to about +200% compared to their concentration levels in a quality baseline motor oil, but does teach that "a basic nitrogen containing dispersant" can vary from 1 to 15 weight percent, and "a detergent in the form of an overbased calcium sulfonate" from

Art Unit: 3625

0.2 to 3 weight percent (General Formulated Example, column 13, lines 1-21). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of engine lubrication at the time of applicant's invention to practice (c) to change at least one of detergent and dispersant concentration levels over the range from about -50% to about +200% compared to their concentration levels in a quality baseline motor oil, for the obvious advantage of producing a customized engine oil having desired properties.

As per claim 22, Denis discloses variations in both detergent and dispersant levels, as noted above in regard to claim 21.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Telco," Osborn, and Denis as applied to claims 8-12 above, and further in view of official notice. Neither "Telco" nor Denis discloses that (c) is practiced to provide about 0.1-100% percent improvement in at least one of fuel economy, wear performance, detergent performance, dispersant performance, oxidation protection, corrosion protection, low temperature performance and blend stability, but Denis does teach adding additives to improve these characteristics, as set forth above. The reasonable presumption is that one would not go to the trouble of attempting to determine optimal quantities of various additives, and the expense of adding these additives, as taught in Denis and other art of record, unless these additives produced a non-trivial improvement in the properties that they were intended to improve. Indeed, one would hardly identify a chemical as, for example, an antiwear additive unless its effects on preventing wear were detectable without extreme effort, implying an improvement greater than 0.1%. Official notice is taken that the effects of many additives are, within a range, dependent on



concentration, so that, even if the improvement were over 100% under some circumstances, a lower concentration would produce an improvement of less than 100% -- and, indeed, it might be that no concentration of an additive would improve performance by more than 100% over a baseline oil. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of engine lubrication at the time of applicant's invention to practice (c) to provide about 0.1-100% improvement in at least one of the listed characteristics, as an obvious consequence of adding desirable additives as taught by Denis.

Claims 17, 18, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Telco," Osborn, and Denis as applied to claims 15 and 16 above (to claim 15 in the case of claims 17 and 19; to claim 16 in the case of claims 18 and 20), and further in view of official notice. These claims are essentially parallel to claim 13, and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Telco," Osborn, and Denis as applied to claims 8-12 above, and further in view of official notice.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Telco" and Osborn as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the admitted prior art. "Telco" does not disclose practicing steps (a) – (c) using formulation guidelines or computer models to maintain industry performance credentials of the customized engine oil, but the instant application teaches that there are accepted industry standard practices outlined in codes introduced by industry organizations such as the American

Chemistry Council and the Technical Committee of Petroleum Additive Manufacturers in Europe (page 2, lines 13-24). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of engine lubrication at the time of applicant's invention to practice (a) – (c) using formulation guidelines or computer models to maintain industry performance credentials of the customized engine oil, for the obvious advantages of benefiting by the accumulated knowledge of the industry, and being able to cite compliance to standard performance credentials as a defense in the event of product liability suits.

### **Claims 23-32**

Claims 23, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0047309) in view of the anonymous article, "Telco, LML, Apollo Tyres Tie up with Castrol," hereinafter "Telco," and Osborn et al. (U.S. Patent 6,182,048). As per claim 23, Bartholomew discloses a method of obtaining a custom lubricant (paragraph 70) by (a) using an implement to transmit user information to a customized blending facility (paragraph 10); (b) blending a custom liquid using the information (paragraphs 7, 9, and 30); and (c) delivering to, installing, or making available for pickup available for pickup by the user the custom liquid (paragraphs 10 and 33). Bartholomew discloses that the custom liquid can be a lubricant (paragraph 70), but does not disclose that the user information is information about a user's motor vehicle type, environment of use, and desired operational characteristics, but "Telco" teaches the choice of an engine oil/lubricant depending on the user's vehicle's specific lubrication needs, in particular, motor vehicle type, to optimize desired operational characteristics (first paragraph).

Art Unit: 3625

Osborn teaches taking into account a vehicle's environment of use (column 3, line 62, through column 4, line 27). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have the information be information about a user's motor vehicle type, environment of use, and desired operational characteristics, for the obvious advantage of making the engine oil optimal for the particular circumstances in which it was to be used.

As per claim 24, Bartholomew discloses use of a computer network (Abstract).

As per claim 25, Bartholomew discloses use of the Internet, a global computer network (Abstract; paragraphs 30, 33, and 34).

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew, "Telco," and Osborn, and as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of official notice. Bartholomew does not expressly disclose that (a) is practiced by electronically displaying a questionnaire on a computer screen connected to a global computer network, and prompting a user a user to input information into the questionnaire (although Bartholomew comes close, in paragraphs 30-33), but official notice is taken that it is well known to obtain data by displaying a questionnaire on a computer screen connected to a global computer network (i.e., the Internet), and prompting a user to input information into the questionnaire. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do this, for the obvious advantage of conveniently obtaining desired data from a remote user.

Claims 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew, "Telco," and Osborn, and as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Denis et al. (U.S. Patent 4,954,273). As per claim 27, Bartholomew does not disclose that blending a custom engine oil is practiced to add additives leading to at least two or more enhanced features selected from enhanced wear protection, enhanced fuel economy, enhanced detergency, enhanced dispersancy, enhanced low temperature startability, enhanced high temperature viscosity, extended drain capability, enhanced wear protection, corrosion protection, enhanced control of oxidation and enhanced blend stability, but Denis teaches adding additives to enhance two or more of these features (Fully Formed Example III, column 13, lines 46-68). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of engine lubrication at the time of applicant's invention to practice (b) to add additives leading to at least two or more of the listed enhanced features, for the obvious advantages of producing increased fuel economy, reduced wear, etc.

As per claim 28, likewise, Denis teaches adding additives to enhance three or more of the listed features (Fully Formed Example III, column 13, lines 46-68), making claim 28 obvious on the same grounds as claim 27.

As per claims 29-32, Denis teaches a customized motor oil containing about 86.24 percent of a baseline motor oil, and at least one of a fuel economy additive, an antiwear additive, a detergent additive, a dispersant additive, a corrosion inhibitor, an antioxidant, a pour point depressant, or a blend stability additive (Fully Formed Example III, column 13, lines 46-68). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art of engine lubrication at the time of applicant's invention to practice (c) to provide a baseline motor oil of from about 50, 60, 75, or 80 percent to 99.9 percent of the final customized engine oil, and at least one of the listed additives, for the obvious advantages of producing increased fuel economy, reduced wear, etc.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed March 15, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that none of the references teaches or suggests customizing motor oil for an individual consumer. Examiner replies that this is not necessarily a claim limitation, since claim 1(c), for example, could be met by providing an existing, mass-produced engine oil which has the recommended or user-desired enhancements. Furthermore, Bartholomew teaches customizing various liquids, including lubricants (paragraph 20).

Applicant argues, secondly, that there is no suggestion or motivation to modify the Telco reference to analyze motor vehicle information by computer since Telco does not address customizing motor oil for an individual consumer, and thirdly, a related point, that a computer is not need in Telco to analyze data in order to provide a motor oil selected on the basis of data input by an individual consumer. Examiner acknowledges that "Telco" does not anticipate Applicant's claims, but replies that the rejection was made on the basis of obviousness, not anticipation. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the

teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Osborne teaches analyzing motor vehicle related information by computer, and a motivation is found in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, "the obvious advantage of using a computer for calculations that may be difficult or time-consuming for human beings to perform, e.g., involving multivariate linear regression, as taught in Osborn, to provide a motor oil selected on the basis of numerous factors." It is very well known to use computers for calculations which would be tedious or practically impossible for humans to perform, or to save the expense of hiring humans to perform them.

On the other hand, claim 1 does not recite any requirement that the data analysis be very involved, and 1(b) might be met by a computer programmed to simply recommend a certain oil for a particular model of car when driven in summer, and another oil for the same car when driven in winter, with other (often overlapping) recommendations for other models of car, and for such other motor vehicles as motorcycles, trucks, and even trains or airplanes. Computerizing a basically simple set of recommendations such as is provided by a written table would not be complicated and non-obvious.

With reference to claims 5-7, Applicant argues that Examiner asserts that claims 5-7 are obvious because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

analyze the data input by the consumer by computer and provide an engine oil responsive to the data analysis. In fact, Examiner did not write that in rejecting claims 5-7, which relate to displaying a questionnaire, prompts, and advertising, on a computer screen. All of these are well known, as Applicant does not dispute, and given the rejections of claims 1 and 4, could not plausibly have been grounds to allow claims 5-7.

Regarding Examiner's use of Denis to reject dependent claims 8-12, 14-16, 21, and 22, Applicant argues that Denis does not teach a "customized motor oil," but an over-based salt additive for crankcase oils, and that Example III in Denis merely provides a fully blended crankcase oil with a slate of additives. Applicant writes, "The present applicants are not claiming the composition of the motor oil, but the method of obtaining a customized motor oil to suit a customer's needs." Examiner agrees such a method is the focus of the applicants' independent claims, but dependent claims 8-12, 14-16, 21, and 22 are directed to the composition of the customized motor oil, making such prior art as Denis relevant. Given that the independent method claims have been found obvious, despite Applicant's disagreement with Examiner on the question, the status of the dependent claims reciting particular additives necessarily arises. If the Applicants were claiming new additives unlike any used before in a motor oil, or additives which for other reasons it was non-obvious to add, the dependent claims could be found allowable on those grounds, but Denis shows that the additives are not novel, but known to be used in examples of prior art engine oils. Therefore, the recitation of particular additives does not make an obvious method of customizing an engine oil non-obvious.

Regarding claim 23 and its dependents, Applicant writes that it is questionable whether Bartholomew is prior art. Examiner replies that although the Bartholomew application was published on November 29, 2001, it claims priority to a provisional filed March 31, 2000, preceding Applicants' filing date of 12, 2000.

Applicants next note that Bartholomew is directed to a Nail Polish Color Selection System and Method, which is true, and write, "Applicants are not convinced that Bartholomew was contemplating lubricants/motor oils as opposed to gels, creams, and body lotions given the context of the patent application." Examiner replies that in paragraph 70, Bartholomew writes, "Thus, the present invention is contemplated to include custom dental material formulations, custom health and beauty aid products, custom fragrances, custom pharmaceutical compounds, custom lubricants [emphasis added], custom foods (e.g., spices, flavors, or the like), custom beverages and other liquid compositions that are to be used or packaged at the point-of-dispensing locations." Thus, whether or not Bartholomew specifically contemplated applying her invention to motor oils, she definitely did contemplate applying it to a wide variety of liquid mixtures, including lubricants, and it is to be noted that she wrote "custom lubricants," rather than "gels, creams, and body lotions," or even "skin lubricants."

In response to Applicant's argument that the Examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does



not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Applicant's arguments specifically regarding the application of Denis, or of displaying a questionnaire on a computer screen, are essentially the same as the arguments presented regarding certain claims depending from claim 1, and Examiner reiterates his replies, as set forth above.

The common knowledge or well-known in the art statements in the previous office action are taken to be admitted prior art, because Applicant did not traverse Examiner's taking of official notice.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The anonymous article, "Ford Issues Winter Care Alert," discloses different motor oils as being recommended for different engines, and discloses owner guides having specific oil recommendations. Butler ("Taking Care of the Car Oil Changes, Squeaky Brakes among Drivers' Top Concerns") discloses owner's manuals with viscosity charts recommending oil weights for various temperature ranges. The anonymous article, "Choosing the Right Motor Oil Just Got Easier," also discloses oil recommendations in owner's manuals. The anonymous article, "Switching Brands of Motor Oil Won't Hurt Car's Warranty," also discloses oil

Art Unit: 3625

recommendations in owner's manuals, and discloses that some recommend specific viscosities for unusual conditions or temperatures.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen, whose telephone number is 571-272-6762. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins, can be reached on 571-272-7159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Non-official/draft communications can be faxed to the examiner at 571-273-6762.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Nicholas D. Rosen*  
**NICHOLAS D. ROSEN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

July 20, 2005